From Gambrell, Palmer, Codling & Mazzoni. (1996). Assessing motivation to read. *The Reading Teacher*, *49*(7). Copyright by the International Reading Association.

Linda B. Gambrell
Barbara Martin Palmer
Rose Marie Codling
Susan Anders Mazzoni

Assessing motivation to read

The Motivation to Read Profile assesses children's self-concepts as readers and the value they see in reading.

Teachers have long recognized that motivation is at the heart of many of the pervasive problems we face in teaching young children to read. In a study conducted by Veenman (1984), teachers ranked motivating students as one of their primary and overriding concerns. A more recent national survey of teachers also revealed that "creating interest in reading" was rated as the most important area for future research (O'Flahavan, Gambrell, Guthrie, Stahl, & Alvermann, 1992). The value teachers place on motivation is supported by a robust research literature that documents the link between motivation and achievement (Elley, 1992; Gambrell & Morrow, in press; Guthrie, Schafer, Wang, & Afflerbach, 1993; Purves & Beach, 1972; Walberg & Tsai, 1985; Wixson & Lipson, 1991). The results of these studies clearly indicate the need to increase our understanding of how children acquire the motivation to develop into active, engaged readers.

Highly motivated readers are self-determining and generate their own reading opportunities. They want to read and choose to read for a wide range of personal reasons such as curiosity, involvement, social interchange, and emotional satisfaction. According to Guthrie (1996), highly motivated readers generate their own literacy learning opportunities, and, in doing so, they begin to determine their own destiny as literacy learners.

Research supports the notion that literacy learning is influenced by a variety of motivational factors (Deci & Ryan, 1985; Eccles, 1983; Ford, 1992; Kuhl, 1986; Lepper, 1988; Maehr, 1976; McCombs, 1991; Wigfield, 1994). A number of current theories suggest that self-perceived competence and task value are major determinants of motivation and task engagement. For example, Eccles (1983) advanced an "expectancy-value" theory of motivation, which states that motivation is strongly influenced by one's expectation of success or failure at a task as well as the "value" or relative attractiveness the individual places on the task. The expectancy component of Eccles's theory is supported by a number of research studies that suggest that students who *believe* they are capable and competent readers are more likely to outperform those who do not hold such beliefs (Paris & Oka, 1986; Schunk, 1985). In addition, students who perceive reading as valuable and important and who have personally relevant reasons for reading will engage in reading in a more planned and effortful manner (Ames & Archer, 1988; Dweck & Elliott, 1983; Paris & Oka, 1986).

©1996 International Reading Association
(pp. 518–533)

Figure 1
Motivation to Read Profile

Reading Survey	Conversational Interview
• Group administration	• Individual administration
• 15 – 20 minutes to administer	• 15 – 20 minutes to administer
• 20 items	• 14 scripted items
• Cued response	• Open-ended free response
• Subscales: Self-Concept as a Reader Value of Reading	• Sections: Narrative reading Informational reading General reading

The work of other motivational theorists, such as Ford (1992) and Winne (1985), has been grounded in the expectancy-value theory. Ford's (1992) motivational systems theory maintains that people will attempt to attain goals they value and perceive as achievable. Similarly, Winne (1985) views the "idealized reader" as one who feels competent and perceives reading as being of personal value and practical importance. Within this theoretical framework, reading motivation is defined by an individual's self-concept and the value the individual places on reading. Evidence from theory and research supports the notion that high motivation to read is associated with positive self-concept and high value assignment, while low motivation to read is associated with poor self-concept as a reader and low value assignment (Ford, 1992; Henk & Melnick, 1995; Wigfield, 1994). Given the emphasis on self-concept and task value in motivation theory, it seems important that teachers have resources for assessing both of these factors.

A review of current instruments designed to assess reading motivation revealed a number of instruments for measuring students' general attitude toward reading (e.g., McKenna & Kear, 1990; Tunnell, Calder, Justen, & Phaup, 1988), as well as several that measure the specific dimension of self-concept (Harter, 1981; Henk & Melnick, 1995; Pintrich & DeGroot, 1990). Henk and Melnick's (1995) instrument, The Reader Self-Perception Scale, was "developed in response to calls in the professional literature for self-evaluation instruments that measure the way readers appraise themselves" (p. 471). The instrument described in this article extends the work of Henk and Melnick by assessing two fundamental components of motivation suggested by motivational theory: self-concept and task value. In addition, none of the existing instruments combine quantitative and qualitative approaches for assessing reading motivation. Our purpose was to develop a public-domain instrument that would provide teachers with an efficient and reliable way to quantitatively and qualitatively assess reading motivation by evaluating students' self-concept as readers and the value they place on reading. This article presents the Motivation to Read Profile (MRP), along with a discussion of its development and suggestions for its use with elementary students.

Description of the Motivation to Read Profile

The MRP consists of two basic instruments: the Reading Survey and the Conversational Interview. The Reading Survey is a self-report, group-administered instrument, and the Conversational Interview is designed for individual administration. The survey assesses two specific dimensions of reading motivation, self-concept as a reader and value of reading; the interview provides information about the individual nature of students' reading motivation, such as what books and stories are most interesting, favorite authors, and where and how children locate reading materials that in-

Figure 2
Motivation to Read Profile

Reading survey

Name_____ Date_____

Sample 1: I am in _____.
- ☐ Second grade ☐ Fifth grade
- ☐ Third grade ☐ Sixth grade
- ☐ Fourth grade

Sample 2: I am a _____.
- ☐ boy
- ☐ girl

1. My friends think I am _____.
   - ☐ a very good reader
   - ☐ a good reader
   - ☐ an OK reader
   - ☐ a poor reader

2. Reading a book is something I like to do.
   - ☐ Never
   - ☐ Not very often
   - ☐ Sometimes
   - ☐ Often

3. I read _____.
   - ☐ not as well as my friends
   - ☐ about the same as my friends
   - ☐ a little better than my friends
   - ☐ a lot better than my friends

4. My best friends think reading is _____.
   - ☐ really fun
   - ☐ fun
   - ☐ OK to do
   - ☐ no fun at all

5. When I come to a word I don't know, I can _____.
   - ☐ almost always figure it out
   - ☐ sometimes figure it out
   - ☐ almost never figure it out
   - ☐ never figure it out

6. I tell my friends about good books I read.
   - ☐ I never do this.
   - ☐ I almost never do this.
   - ☐ I do this some of the time.
   - ☐ I do this a lot.

(continued)

Figure 2
Motivation to Read Profile (cont'd.)

7. When I am reading by myself, I understand _____.
   - ☐ almost everything I read
   - ☐ some of what I read
   - ☐ almost none of what I read
   - ☐ none of what I read

8. People who read a lot are _____.
   - ☐ very interesting
   - ☐ interesting
   - ☐ not very interesting
   - ☐ boring

9. I am _____.
   - ☐ a poor reader
   - ☐ an OK reader
   - ☐ a good reader
   - ☐ a very good reader

10. I think libraries are _____.
   - ☐ a great place to spend time
   - ☐ an interesting place to spend time
   - ☐ an OK place to spend time
   - ☐ a boring place to spend time

11. I worry about what other kids think about my reading _____.
   - ☐ every day
   - ☐ almost every day
   - ☐ once in a while
   - ☐ never

12. Knowing how to read well is _____.
   - ☐ not very important
   - ☐ sort of important
   - ☐ important
   - ☐ very important

13. When my teacher asks me a question about what I have read, I _____.
   - ☐ can never think of an answer
   - ☐ have trouble thinking of an answer
   - ☐ sometimes think of an answer
   - ☐ always think of an answer

14. I think reading is _____.
   - ☐ a boring way to spend time
   - ☐ an OK way to spend time
   - ☐ an interesting way to spend time
   - ☐ a great way to spend time

(continued)

Figure 2
Motivation to Read Profile (cont'd.)

15. Reading is _____.
- ☐ very easy for me
- ☐ kind of easy for me
- ☐ kind of hard for me
- ☐ very hard for me

16. When I grow up I will spend _____.
- ☐ none of my time reading
- ☐ very little of my time reading
- ☐ some of my time reading
- ☐ a lot of my time reading

17. When I am in a group talking about stories, I _____.
- ☐ almost never talk about my ideas
- ☐ sometimes talk about my ideas
- ☐ almost always talk about my ideas
- ☐ always talk about my ideas

18. I would like for my teacher to read books out loud to the class _____.
- ☐ every day
- ☐ almost every day
- ☐ once in a while
- ☐ never

19. When I read out loud I am a _____.
- ☐ poor reader
- ☐ OK reader
- ☐ good reader
- ☐ very good reader

20. When someone gives me a book for a present, I feel _____.
- ☐ very happy
- ☐ sort of happy
- ☐ sort of unhappy
- ☐ unhappy

terest them most. Figure 1 profiles the two instruments.

Because the MRP combines information from a group-administered survey instrument with an individual interview, it provides a useful tool for exploring more fully the personal dimensions of students' reading motivation. The MRP is highly individualized, which makes it particularly appropriate for inclusion in portfolio assessment.

The Reading Survey. This instrument consists of 20 items and uses a 4-point response scale (see Figure 2). The survey assesses two specific dimensions of reading motivation: self-concept as a reader (10 items) and value of reading (10 items). The items that focus on self-concept as a reader are designed to elicit information about students' self-perceived competence in reading and self-perceived performance relative to peers. The value of reading items are designed to elicit information about the value students place on reading tasks and activities, particularly in terms of frequency of engagement and reading-related activities.

The Conversational Interview. The interview is made up of three sections (see Figure 3).

Figure 3
Motivation to Read Profile

Conversational Interview

Name _____ Date _____

A. Emphasis: Narrative text

Suggested prompt (designed to engage student in a natural conversation): I have been reading a good book…I was talking with…about it last night. I enjoy talking about good stories and books that I've been reading. Today I'd like to hear about what you have been reading.

1. Tell me about the most interesting story or book you have read this week (or even last week). Take a few minutes to think about it. (Wait time.) Now, tell me about the book or story.

Probes: What else can you tell me? Is there anything else? _____

2. How did you know or find out about this story? _____

☐ assigned ☐ in school
☐ chosen ☐ out of school

3. Why was this story interesting to you? _____

B. Emphasis: Informational text

Suggested prompt (designed to engage student in a natural conversation): Often we read to find out about something or to learn about something. We read for information. For example, I remember a student of mine…who read a lot of books about…to find out as much as he/she could about…. Now, I'd like to hear about some of the informational reading you have been doing.

1. Think about something important that you learned recently, not from your teacher and not from television, but from a book or some other reading material. What did you read about? (Wait time.) Tell me about what you learned.

Probes: What else could you tell me? Is there anything else? _____

2. How did you know or find out about this book/article? _____

☐ assigned ☐ in school
☐ chosen ☐ out of school

(continued)

Figure 3
Motivation to Read Profile (cont'd.)

3. Why was this book (or article) important to you? _____

C. Emphasis: General reading

1. Did you read anything at home yesterday? _____ What?

2. Do you have any books at school (in your desk/storage area/locker/book bag) today that you are reading? _____ Tell me about them.

3. Tell me about your favorite author.

4. What do you think you have to learn to be a better reader?

5. Do you know about any books right now that you'd like to read? Tell me about them.

6. How did you find out about these books?

7. What are some things that get you really excited about reading books?

Tell me about…

8. Who gets you really interested and excited about reading books?

Tell me more about what they do.

The first section probes motivational factors related to the reading of narrative text (3 questions); the second section elicits information about informational reading (3 questions); and the final section focuses on more general factors related to reading motivation (8 questions).

The interview is designed to initiate an informal, conversational exchange between the teacher and student. According to Burgess (1980), conversational interviews are social events that can provide greater depth of understanding than more rigid interview techniques. Although conversational interviews are scripted, deviations from the script are anticipated and expected (Baker, 1984). The teacher is encouraged to deviate from the basic script in order to glean information that might otherwise be missed or omitted in a more formal, standardized interview approach. Teachers need to keep in mind that the primary purpose of the conversational interview is to generate information that will provide authentic insights into students' reading experiences. Participating in a conversational interview allows children to use their unique ways of describing their reading motivation and experiences and to raise ideas and issues related to personal motivation that may not be reflected in the scripted interview items (Denzin, 1970).

How was the MRP developed?

Item selection for the MRP was based on a review of research and theories related to motivation and included an analysis of existing instruments designed to assess motivation and attitude toward reading. A number of instruments were examined in order to gather ideas for the development of an initial pool of MRP items (Gottfried, 1986; Harter, 1981; Johnson & Gaskins, 1991; McKenna & Kear, 1990; Pintrich & DeGroot, 1990; Raynor & Nochajski, 1986; Schell, 1992; Tunnell et al., 1988).

An assessment instrument is useful only if it is valid and reliable. Validity refers to the instrument's ability to measure the trait it purports to measure, and reliability refers to the ability of the instrument to consistently measure that trait. To gain information about the validity and reliability of the MRP, the Reading Survey and the Conversational Interview were field tested.

Development and field testing of the Reading Survey. The criteria for item selection and development for the survey instrument included: (a) applicability to Grades 2 through 6, (b) applicability to all teaching approaches and materials, (c) suitability for group administration, and (d) accuracy in reflecting the appropriate dimension of motivation, i.e., self-concept or value. All survey items employ a 4-point response scale to avoid neutral, central response patterns. A 4-point scale also seemed more appropriate for elementary students as there is some evidence to suggest that young children have difficulty simultaneously discriminating among more than five discrete categories (Case & Khanna, 1981; Nitko, 1983). In order to avoid repetition in the presentation of the response alternatives and to control for the threat of "response set" (i.e., children selecting the same responses for each item), some response alternatives proceed from most positive to least positive while others are ordered in the opposite way.

An initial pool of survey items was developed based on the criteria described above. Three experienced classroom teachers, who were also graduate students in reading, critiqued over 100 items for their construct validity in assessing students' self-concept or value of reading. We compiled the items that received 100% agreement. These items were then submitted to four classroom teachers who were asked to sort the items into three categories: measures self-concept, measures value of reading, not sure or questionable. Only those items that received 100% trait agreement were selected for inclusion on the Reading Survey instrument used in the field testing.

The final version of the Reading Survey instrument was administered in the late fall and early spring with 330 third- and fifth-grade students in 27 classrooms in 4 schools from 2 school districts in an eastern U.S. state. To determine whether the traits measured by the Reading Survey (Self-Concept as a Reader and Value of Reading) corresponded to the two subscales, factor analyses were conducted using the unweighted least squares method and a varimax rotation. Only items that loaded cleanly on the two traits were included in the final instrument. To assess the internal consistency of the Reading Survey, Cronbach's (1951) alpha statistic was calculated, which revealed a moderately high reliability for both subscales

(self-concept = .75; value = .82). In addition, pre- and posttest reliability coefficients were calculated for the subscales (self-concept = .68; value = .70), which confirmed the moderately high reliability of the instrument.

Development and field testing of the Conversational Interview. Approximately 60 open-ended questions regarding narrative and informational reading, general and specific reading experiences, and home and school reading practices were developed for the initial pool of interview items. These items were field tested in the spring with a stratified random sample of 48 students (24 third graders and 24 fifth graders). Classroom teachers identified students as at grade level, above grade level, or below grade level. The teachers were then asked to identify, within each of the three ability level lists, the two most "highly motivated readers" and the two "least motivated readers." Twenty-four students from the list of most highly motivated readers and 24 students from the list of least motivated readers participated in the field testing of the 60 interview items. Two graduate students, who were former classroom teachers, analyzed the 48 student protocols and selected 14 questions that revealed the most useful information about students' motivation to read. These 14 questions were used for the final version of the Conversational Interview.

Validity and reliability of the MRP. Additional steps were taken to validate the final version of the MRP. Responses to the survey and conversational interview were examined for consistency of information across the two instruments. The survey and interview responses of 2 highly motivated and 2 less motivated readers were randomly selected for analysis. Two independent raters compared each student's responses on the survey instrument and the interview. For example, one item on the survey asks the students to indicate whether they think they are a "very good reader," "good reader," "OK reader," or "poor reader." Comments made during the conversational interview were analyzed to determine if students provided any confirming evidence about their self-perceived competence in reading.

Two raters independently compared each student's responses to items on the survey with information provided during the interview, with an interrater agreement of .87. There was consistent, supporting information in the interview responses for approximately 70% of the information tapped in the survey instrument. The results of these data analyses support the notion that the children responded consistently on both types of assessment instruments (survey, interview) and across time (fall, spring).

A further test of the validity of the Reading Survey explored the relationship between level of motivation and reading achievement. Motivational theory and research indicate a positive correlation between motivation and achievement (Ford, 1992; McKenna & Kear, 1990). Teachers categorized students as having low, average, or high reading performance. Statistically significant differences were found among the mean scores on the self-concept measure for high, middle, and low reading achievement groups, revealing that scores were positively associated with level of reading achievement. In addition, statistically significant differences were found between mean scores of third- and fifth-grade students on the value measure, with younger students scoring more positively than older students. This finding is in keeping with the work of other researchers, who have found that attitude toward reading decreases as children progress through the elementary grades (e.g., McKenna & Kear, 1990).

Administering the MRP

The MRP combines group and individual assessment procedures. The Reading Survey instrument can be administered to an entire class, small group, or individual, while the Conversational Interview is designed to be conducted on an individual basis.

Administration and scoring of the Reading Survey. The administration of the Reading Survey instrument takes approximately 15–20 minutes (see Figure 4). Teachers should consider grade level and attention span when deciding how and when to administer it. For example, teachers of young children may decide to administer the first 10 items in one session and the final 10 during a second session.

The survey is designed to be read aloud to students. One of the problems inherent in much of the motivational research is that reading ability often confounds the results so that proficient, higher ability readers are typically identified as "motivated," while less profi-

Figure 4
Teacher directions: MRP Reading Survey

Distribute copies of the Reading Survey. Ask students to write their names on the space provided.

Say:
I am going to read some sentences to you. I want to know how you feel about your reading. There are no right or wrong answers. I really want to know how you honestly feel about reading.
I will read each sentence twice. Do not mark your answer until I tell you to. The first time I read the sentence I want you to think about the best answer for you. The second time I read the sentence I want you to fill in the space beside your best answer. Mark only one answer. Remember: Do not mark your answer until I tell you to. OK, let's begin.

Read the first sample item. Say:
Sample 1: I am in (pause) first grade, (pause) second grade, (pause) third grade, (pause) fourth grade, (pause) fifth grade, (pause) sixth grade.

Read the first sample again. Say:
This time as I read the sentence, mark the answer that is right for you. I am in (pause) first grade, (pause) second grade, (pause) third grade, (pause) fourth grade, (pause) fifth grade, (pause) sixth grade.

Read the second sample item. Say:
Sample 2: I am a (pause) boy, (pause) girl.

Say:
Now, get ready to mark your answer.
I am a (pause) boy, (pause) girl.

Read the remaining items in the same way (e.g., number ____, sentence stem followed by a pause, each option followed by a pause, and then give specific directions for students to mark their answers while you repeat the entire item).

cient, lower ability readers are identified as "unmotivated." This characterization is inaccurate; there are proficient readers who are not highly motivated to read, just as there are less proficient readers who are highly motivated to read (McCombs, 1991; Roettger, 1980). When students are instructed to independently read and respond to survey items, the results for the less proficient, lower ability readers may not be reliable due to their frustration when reading the items. For these reasons, the Reading Survey is designed to be read aloud by the teacher to help ensure the veracity of student responses.

Students must understand that their responses to the survey items will not be graded. They should be told that the results of the survey will provide information that the teacher can use to make reading more interesting for them and that the information will be helpful only if they provide their most honest responses.

Directions for scoring the Reading Survey (see Figure 5) and a scoring sheet (see Figure 6) are provided. When scoring the survey, the most positive response is assigned the highest number (4) while the least positive response is assigned the lowest number (1). For example, if a student reported that he/she is a "good" reader, a "3" would be recorded. Teachers can compute percentage scores on the entire Reading Survey or on the two subscales (Self-Concept as a Reader and Value of Reading). Space is also provided at the bottom of the scoring sheet for the teacher to note any interesting or unusual responses that might be probed later during the conversational interview.

Administration of the Conversational Interview. The Conversational Interview is designed to elicit information that will help the teacher gain a deeper understanding of a stu-

dent's reading motivation in an informal, conversational manner (see Figure 7). The entire interview takes approximately 15–20 minutes, but it can easily be conducted in three 5- to 7-minute sessions, one for each of the three sections of the interview (narrative, informational, and general reading). Individual portfolio conferences are an ideal time to conduct the interview.

We suggest that teachers review student responses on the Reading Survey prior to conducting the Conversational Interview so that they may contemplate and anticipate possible topics to explore. During a conversational interview, some children will talk enthusiastically without probing, but others may need support and encouragement. Children who are shy or who tend to reply in short, quick an-

Figure 5
Scoring directions: MRP Reading Survey

The survey has 20 items based on a 4-point scale. The highest total score possible is 80 points. On some items the response options are ordered least positive to most positive (see item 2 below), with the least positive response option having a value of 1 point and the most positive option having a point value of 4. On other items, however, the response options are reversed (see item 1 below). In those cases it will be necessary to *recode* the response options. Items where recoding is required are starred on the scoring sheet.

Example: Here is how Maria completed items 1 and 2 on the Reading Survey.

1. My friends think I am _____.
   - ☐ a very good reader
   - ■ a good reader
   - ☐ an OK reader
   - ☐ a poor reader

2. Reading a book is something I like to do.
   - ☐ Never
   - ☐ Not very often
   - ☐ Sometimes
   - ■ Often

To score item 1 it is first necessary to recode the response options so that
a poor reader equals 1 point,
an OK reader equals 2 points,
a good reader equals 3 points, and
a very good reader equals 4 points.

Since Maria answered that she is *a good reader* the point value for that item, 3, is entered on the first line of the Self-Concept column on the scoring sheet. See below.

The response options for item 2 are ordered least positive (1 point) to most positive (4 points), so scoring item 2 is easy. Simply enter the point value associated with Maria's response. Because Maria selected the fourth option, a 4 is entered for item 2 under the Value of Reading column on the scoring sheet. See below.

Scoring sheet

Self-Concept as a Reader	Value of Reading
*recode 1. 3	2. 4

To calculate the Self-Concept raw score and Value raw score add all student responses in the respective column. The Full Survey raw score is obtained by combining the column raw scores. To convert the raw scores to percentage scores, divide student raw scores by the total possible score (40 for each subscale, 80 for the full survey).

Figure 6
MRP Reading Survey scoring sheet

Student name _____

Grade _____ Teacher _____

Administration date _____

Recoding scale

1 = 4
2 = 3
3 = 2
4 = 1

Self-Concept as a Reader		**Value of Reading**	
			2.____
*recode	1.____	*recode	4.____
	3.____		6.____
*recode	5.____	*recode	8.____
*recode	7.____	*recode	10.____
	9.____		12.____
*recode	11.____		14.____
	13.____		16.____
*recode	15.____	*recode	18.____
	17.____	*recode	20.____
	19.____		

SC raw score: ____/40 **V raw score:** ____/40

Full survey raw score (Self-Concept & Value): ____/80

Percentage scores
Self-Concept ☐
Value ☐
Full Survey ☐

Comments: _____

_____

_____

swers can be encouraged to elaborate upon their responses through nonthreatening phrases like "Tell me more about that…," "What else can you tell me…," and "Why do you think that…." Probing of brief responses from children is often necessary in order to reveal important and relevant information.

Teachers are also encouraged to extend, modify, and adapt the 14 questions outlined in the Conversational Interview, especially during conversations with individual students. Follow-up questions based on students' comments often provide the most significant information in such an interview.

Using the results of the MRP to make instructional decisions

Information from the results of the MRP can be used to plan instructional activities that will support students' reading development. The following list provides some ideas for ways in which the results can be used to enhance literacy learning. First, specific recom-

Figure 7
Teacher directions: MRP Conversational Interview

1. Duplicate the Conversational Interview so that you have a form for each child.
2. Choose in advance the section(s) or specific questions you want to ask from the Conversational Interview. Reviewing the information on students' Reading Surveys may provide information about additional questions that could be added to the interview.
3. Familiarize yourself with the basic questions provided in the interview prior to the interview session in order to establish a more conversational setting.
4. Select a quiet corner of the room and a calm period of the day for the interview.
5. Allow ample time for conducting the Conversational Interview.
6. Follow up on interesting comments and responses to gain a fuller understanding of students' reading experiences.
7. Record students' responses in as much detail as possible. If time and resources permit you may want to audiotape answers to A1 and B1 to be transcribed after the interview for more in-depth analysis.
8. Enjoy this special time with each student!

mendations are presented for using the results of the Reading Survey and the Conversational Interview. Then, general recommendations for using the MRP are provided.

Using the results of the Reading Survey.

• Because of the highly individualized nature of motivation, careful examination of an individual's responses may provide valuable insights that can be used to create more meaningful, motivational contexts for reading instruction. For example, if a child indicates on the survey form that "reading is very hard" and that "reading is boring," the teacher can suggest books of particular interest to the child that the child can read with ease.

• A total score and scores on the two subscales of the Reading Survey (Self-Concept as a Reader and Value of Reading) can be computed for each student. Teachers can then identify those children who have lower scores in these areas. These students may be the ones who are in need of additional support in developing motivation to read and may benefit from interventions to promote reading engagement.

• Students who have lower subscores on the Self-Concept as a Reader scale may benefit from experiences that highlight successful reading. For example, to build feelings of competence, the teacher can arrange for the child to read books to children in lower grades.

• Students who have lower subscores on the Value of Reading scale may benefit from experiences that emphasize meaningful purposes for reading. For example, the teacher can ask the child to read about how to care for a class pet or involve the child in class plays or skits.

• If many children score low on the Value of Reading scale, the teacher can implement meaningful cooperative group activities where children teach one another about what they have read regarding a particular topic. The teacher can also involve the class in projects that require reading instructions, e.g., preparing a recipe, creating a crafts project, or performing a science experiment.

• Class averages for the total score and subscores on the Reading Survey can be computed. This information may be helpful in obtaining an overview of the classroom level of motivation at various points throughout the school year.

• Teachers may also analyze class responses to an individual item on the Reading Survey. For example, if many children indicate that they seldom read at home, the teacher may decide to implement a home reading program, or the teacher might discuss the importance of home reading and parent involvement during Parent Night. Another survey item asks children to complete the following statement: "I think libraries are…." If many students report a nega-

tive response toward libraries, the teacher can probe the class for further information in order to identify reasons, which can then be addressed.

Using the results of the Conversational Interview.

• The primary purpose of the Conversational Interview is to gain insight into what motivates the student to engage in reading. Therefore, the interview questions focus on reading that students find most interesting. This information can inform the teacher about specific topics, books, and authors that the individual student finds engaging and motivating.

• The Conversational Interview might also reveal particular activities related to reading that the child enjoys. For example, one child in our field study mentioned his father several times during the interview—reading to his father, telling his father about something interesting he had read, and selecting and buying books with his father. In such a situation, a teacher can suggest home activities or even specific books that the father and child might enjoy reading at home.

• Class responses to items on the Conversational Interview may also reveal useful information. For example, if many children express interest in a particular topic, the teacher may find ways to include reading activities regarding the topic. If children express interest in a particular instructional activity, such as inviting guest readers into the classroom or "Young Authors' Night" where children present their stories to parents and guests, this information can then be taken into account for future planning.

General recommendations for using the MRP.

• The MRP can provide a means of assessing, monitoring, and documenting student responses to innovations in the classroom that are designed to promote reading motivation. For example, the teacher might collect information using the MRP prior to and following the implementation of a reading motivational intervention, such as a sustained silent reading program or involvement in a classroom or a schoolwide reading motivational program.

• The MRP can be given at the beginning of the year to provide the teacher with profiles of each child. This information can be placed in children's reading portfolios. Teachers may decide to administer the MRP several times throughout the school year so that changes in the child's attitudes and interests about reading can be documented and compared.

• The MRP can be administered at each grade level and the assessment data retained so that teachers can compare changes in a child's self-concept as a reader and value of reading as he/she progresses from grade to grade.

These are only a sampling of ideas of the ways in which the MRP can be used in the classroom. Each teacher will have his/her own particular insights about ways in which the MRP information can best be applied to meet students' needs.

Cautions about interpreting responses to the MRP. Although there is support for the reliability and validity of the MRP, it is a self-report instrument, and it has limitations that are commonly associated with such instruments. For example, it is impossible to determine from self-report instruments alone whether or not students actually feel, believe, or do the things they report. Even though the elaborate, descriptive information gleaned from the interview can substantiate survey responses to some extent, only careful observation can verify information derived from the MRP.

Each teacher will have his/her own particular insights about the ways in which MRP information can be best applied.

Also, one should be cautious when interpreting responses to individual items due to the contextual nature of reading motivation. For example, a student might feel highly competent as a reader when reading high-interest, self-selected narrative materials and yet feel far less competent when reading content area materials. It is more important to look across the survey and interview responses to determine patterns that reveal factors that are relevant to the student's reading motivation.

Finally, as with any assessment, the MRP should be used in conjunction with other assessment instruments, techniques, and procedures. Teachers should consider the MRP as one source of information about reading motivation.

Summary

Motivation is an integral component of reading instruction. In addition, a number of studies suggest a connection between motivation and achievement. Current motivational theory emphasizes the role of self-perceived competence and task value as determinants of motivation and task engagement. The Motivation to Read Profile was developed to provide teachers with an efficient and reliable instrument for assessing reading motivation by evaluating students' self-concept as readers and the value they place on reading. In addition, the assessment instrument provides both quantitative and qualitative information by combining the use of a survey instrument and an individual interview.

There are a number of ways in which the MRP can be used to make instructional decisions, and teachers are in the best position to decide how they will apply the information gleaned from the MRP in their classrooms. Ideally, the MRP will help teachers acquire insights about individual students, particularly those students whom teachers worry most about in terms of their reading motivation and development. The individualized nature of the information derived from the MRP makes this instrument particularly appropriate for inclusion in portfolio assessment. Careful scrutiny of the responses to the Reading Survey and the Conversational Interview, coupled with teacher observations of student behaviors in various classroom reading contexts, can help teachers plan for meaningful instruction that will support students in becoming highly motivated readers.

Authors' notes

We would like to thank the students, teachers, and principals in Charles and Frederick Counties, Maryland, USA, for their support and assistance in the piloting and development of the instruments described in this article.

The work reported here is a National Reading Research Project of the University of Georgia and University of Maryland. It was supported under the Educational Research and Development Centers Program (PR/AWARD NO. 117A20007) as administered by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education. The findings and opinions expressed here do not necessarily reflect the position or policies of the National Reading Research Center, the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, or the U.S. Department of Education.

Gambrell, Codling, and Mazzoni teach at the University of Maryland. Palmer teaches at Mount Saint Mary's College in Emmitsburg, Maryland, USA. All four conduct research at the National Reading Research Center. Gambrell may be contacted at NRRC, University of Maryland, 3216 J.M. Patterson, College Park, MD 20742, USA.

References

Ames, C., & Archer, J. (1988). Achievement goals in the classroom: Students' learning strategies and motivation processes. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 80*, 260–267.

Baker, C.D. (1984). The search for adultness: Membership work in adolescent-adult talk. *Human Studies, 7*, 301–323.

Burgess, R. (1980). *Field research: A sourcebook and field manual.* London: Allen & Uwin.

Case, R., & Khanna, F. (1981). The missing links: Stages in children's progression from sensorimotor to logical thought. In K.W. Fischer (Ed.), *Cognitive development: New directions for child development* (pp. 21–32). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cronbach, L.J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika, 16*, 297–334.

Deci, E., & Ryan, R. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. New York: Plenum.

Denzin, N. (1970). *The research act in sociology*. London: Butterworth.

Dweck, C., & Elliott, E. (1983). Achievement motivation. In E.M. Heatherington (Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology: Vol. 4. Socialization, personality, and social development* (pp. 643–691). New York: Wiley.

Eccles, J. (1983). Expectancies, values and academic behaviors. In J.T. Spence (Ed.), *Achievement and achievement motives* (pp. 75–146). San Francisco: Freeman.

Elley, W.B. (1992). *How in the world do students read?* Hamburg, Germany: International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement.

Ford, M.E. (1992). *Motivating humans.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Gambrell, L.B., & Morrow, L.M. (in press). Creating motivating contexts for literacy learning. In L. Baker, P. Afflerbach, & D. Reinking (Eds.), *Developing engaged readers in home and school communities*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Gottfried, A.E. (1986). *Children's academic intrinsic motivation inventory.* Odessa, FL: Psychological Assess-

ment Resources.
Guthrie, J.T. (1996). Educational contexts for engagement in literacy. *The Reading Teacher*, *49*, 432 – 445.
Guthrie, J.T., Schafer, W., Wang, Y., & Afflerbach, P. (1993). *Influences of instruction on reading engagement: An empirical exploration of a social-cognitive framework of reading activity* (Research Report No. 3). Athens, GA: National Reading Research Center.
Harter, S. (1981). A new self-report scale of intrinsic versus extrinsic orientation in the classroom: Motivational and informational components. *Developmental Psychology, 17*, 300–312.
Henk, W., & Melnick, S.A. (1995). The Reader Self-Perception Scale (RSPS): A new tool for measuring how children feel about themselves as readers. *The Reading Teacher, 48*, 470–482.
Johnson, C.S., & Gaskins, J. (1991). Reading attitude: Types of materials and specific strategies. *Reading Improvement, 28*, 237–242.
Kuhl, J. (1986). Introduction. In J. Kuhl & J.W. Atkinson (Eds.), *Motivation, thought, and action* (pp. 1–16). New York: Praeger.
Lepper, M.R. (1988). Motivational considerations in the study of instruction. *Cognition and Instruction, 5*, 289–309.
Maehr, M.L. (1976). Continuing motivation: An analysis of a seldom considered educational outcome. *Review of Educational Research, 46*, 443–462.
McCombs, B.L. (1991). Unraveling motivation: New perspectives from research and practice. *Journal of Experimental Education, 60*, 3–88.
McKenna, M.C., & Kear, D.J. (1990). Measuring attitude toward reading: A new tool for teachers. *The Reading Teacher, 43*, 626–639.
Nitko, A.J. (1983). *Educational tests and measurement: An introduction*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
O'Flahavan, J., Gambrell, L.B., Guthrie, J., Stahl, S., & Alvermann, D. (1992). Poll results guide activities of research center. *Reading Today, 10*, p. 12.
Paris, S.G., & Oka, E.R. (1986). Self-regulated learning among exceptional children. *Exceptional Children, 53*, 103–108.
Pintrich, P.R., & DeGroot, E.V. (1990). Motivational and self-regulated learning components of classroom academic performance. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 82*, 33–40.
Purves, A., & Beach, R. (1972). *Literature and the reader: Research on response to literature, reading interests, and teaching of literature*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
Raynor, J.O., & Nochajski, T.H. (1986). Development of the motivation for particular activity scale. In D.R. Brown & I. Vernoff (Eds.), *Frontiers of motivational psychology* (pp. 1–25). New York: Springer-Verlag.
Roettger, D. (1980). Elementary students' attitudes toward reading. *The Reading Teacher, 33*, 451–453.
Schell, L.M. (1992). Student perceptions of good and poor readers. *Reading Improvement, 29*, 50–55.
Schunk, D. (1985). Self-efficacy and school learning. *Psychology in the Schools, 22*, 208–223.
Tunnell, M.O., Calder, J.E., Justen, J.E., & Phaup, E.S. (1988). Attitudes of young readers. *Reading Improvement, 25*, 237–242.
Veenman, S. (1984). Perceived problems of beginning teachers. *Review of Educational Research, 54*, 143–178.
Walberg, H.J., & Tsai, S. (1985). Correlates of reading achievement and attitude: A national assessment study. *Journal of Educational Research, 78*, 159–167.
Wigfield, A. (1994). Expectancy-value theory of achievement motivation: A developmental perspective. *Educational Psychology Review, 6*(1), 48–78.
Winne, P. (1985). Steps toward promoting cognitive achievements. *Elementary School Journal, 85*, 673–693.
Wixson, K.K., & Lipson, M.Y. (1991). *Reading diagnosis and remediation*. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.